

**REMARKS**

The claims have been amended as supported by the specification as originally filed.

New Claims 8-40 have been added as supported by the specification as originally filed.

No new matter is believed to have been added by entry of this amendment. Entry and favorable reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this amendment Claims 1-40 will now be active in this application.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, as amended, in view of the following remarks.

The objection to the specification has been obviated by the amendment of the specification. Additional headings were provided as requested by the Examiner and the trademark TEMPOL has been capitalized. However, Applicants note that the original specification did have proper sections as well as headings. In addition, PLEX was already capitalized throughout the specification. Thus, this objection should be withdrawn.

The objection to Claim 1 is obviated by the amendment of Claim 1.

The objection to Claim 6, is traversed. The polymers are well known by their abbreviations to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, this objection should be withdrawn.

Regarding the provisional double patenting rejection over Serial No. 10/548,878, the MPEP instructs the Examiner to withdraw the provisional rejection if it is the only issue

remaining in one case and convert the provisional rejection in the other application to a double patenting rejection. MPEP 822.01. Applicants note that the present case (Serial No. 10/578,568) is the first filed case.

The rejection of Claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, is obviated by the amendment of the claims. It is noted that the binders are disclosed at pages 4 to 5 and the thickener is disclosed at pages 6 to 9 of the specification. Thus, the claims are definite when interpreted in view of the specification. Thus, this rejection should be withdrawn.

In regard to the Examiner's request to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made, Applicants' Representative is confirming with the Applicants that all claims were and are commonly owned. Applicants' Representative will update the Examiner in the event that the claims are not commonly owned.

The present invention as set forth in **amended Claim 1** relates to a process for producing a moulding from a plastic, comprising:

coating a moulding on one or more sides with a lacquer system,

wherein the lacquer system comprises:

- a) a binder or a binder mixture;
- b) optionally, a solvent or solvent mixture;
- c) optionally, a lacquer systems additive; and
- d) a thickener selected from the group consisting of 0 to 20% by weight

of polymeric thickeners at from 0 to 20% content and 0 to 40 % by weight of

oligomeric thickeners at from 0 to 40% content, based on dry film components a), c), d) and e);

e) from 5 to 500 parts by weight, based on component a), of an electrically conductive metal oxide in the form of a powder, a dispersion and/or a sol, having a median primary particle size of from 1 to 80 nm and a percentage degree of aggregation of from 0.01 to 99%, **wherein said degree of aggregation is based on aggregates which comprise at least two primary particles;**

f) from 5 to 500 parts by weight, based on component a), of coated inert nanoparticles; and

curing said lacquer system.

In contrast, Hino et al fail to disclose or suggest process for producing a moulding, as claimed, in which a lacquer composition is used which comprises e) from 5 to 500 parts by weight, based on a), of an electrically conductive metal oxide powder with a median primary particle size of from 1 to 80 nm and a percentage degree of aggregation of from 0.01 to 99%, **wherein said degree of aggregation is based on aggregates which comprise at least two primary particles.**

In addition, Hino et al fail to disclose or suggest the subject matter claimed in the dependent claims and in particular in new Claims 8-40.

In Example 1, paragraph [0124] of Hino et al. discloses a combination of silica and ATO. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion of an ATO having a percentage degree of aggregation of from 0.01 to 99%, **wherein said degree of aggregation is based on aggregates which comprise at least two primary particles.**

Even if there was any aggregation in Hino et al, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not know what type of particles aggregate based on the disclosure of Hino et al. However, in the present invention it is claimed that the aggregates comprise at least two primary particles.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hino et al is believed to be unsustainable as the present invention is neither anticipated nor obvious and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

This application presents allowable subject matter, and the Examiner is kindly requested to pass it to issue. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the claims or otherwise wish to discuss this case, he is kindly invited to contact Applicants' below-signed representative, who would be happy to provide any assistance deemed necessary in speeding this application to allowance.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
NFO:KAG:  
(OSMMN 08/07)

  
Kirsten A. Gruenberg, Ph.D.  
Registration No.: 47,297